5. Tuticorin Alkali Chemicals and Fertilizers Limited, Tuticorin	17.4	—	17.0	—
SSP Units :				
6. Coimbatore Pioneer Fertilizers Limited, Coimbatore	—	5.7	—	3.5
7. EID Parry (India) Limited, Ranipet, Madras	—	8.2	—	9.4
8. Indag Products Limited Cuddalore	—	0.3	—	—
9. Kothari Industrial Corporation Limited, Ennore	—	10.5	—	8.8
10. Shaw Wallace & Company Limited, Avadi, Madras	—	10.0	—	—
TOTAL :	627.8	408.1	599.4	368.5

Prices of fertilizers

459. DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) what are the present prices of various fertilizers—both imported and indigenous;

(b) whether it is a fact that recently some subsidy scheme was announced for phosphorous and potash-fertilizers produced indigenously; and

(c) if so, what is its impacts?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERriLIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) Government have statutorily fixed as under the maximum selling price of following varieties of fertilizers :—

Sl. No.	Name of Fertilizers	Maximum price per tonne (in rupees)
1.	Urea (46% N)	2760
2.	Anhydrous Ammonia	4420
3.	Zincated Urea	3940
4.	Calcium Ammonium Nitrate (25% N)	2000
5.	Calcium Ammonium Nitrate (26% N)	2080
6.	Ammonium Sulphate (20.6% N)	1920
7.	Ammonium Chloride (25% N)	2000

These prices are uniformly fixed both for indigenous and imported varieties.

In respect of other varieties of fertilizers, not mentioned above producers/suppliers are free to sell them in the open market at prices to be determined by them.

(b) and (c) Government of India has recently announced a concession of Rs. 1000 per tonne on the sale of indigenous DAP and proportionately in respect of other complex fertilizers and SSP. Similar concession of Rs. 1000 per tonne has also been announced on sale of MOP to the farmers.

Delay in Procurement of Equipment by I.D.P.L

460. SHRI RAMCHANDRAN PILLAI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that due to the delay in (he procurement by I.D.P.L., the Scientific Personnel had to carry out research on the projects sanctioned by the Biotechnology Department by making use of inefficient equipments:

(b) if so, what were the reasons for the delay; and

(c) the steps taken to avoid such incidents ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) The Department of Biotechnology has approved four projects for a period of 5 years (1990-91 to 1994-95). Some of the equipments required urgently were already procured (1990-91). For remaining equipment, the procurement

is being done in a phased manner, based on the progress of related projects. The existing equipment/facilities were also utilised to carry out research work on the Department of Biotechnology's approved projects. Therefore, the research work did not suffer on accounfof delay in procu.-ement of equipment and was not carried out on inefficient equipment.

(b) and (c) The Department of Biotechnology has constituted an Expert-cum-Monitoring Committee which reviews the progress from time to time.

Action Against Marketing Executive of IDPL.

461. SHRI MD. SALIM: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the reply to Unstarred Question No. 1915 given in Rajya Sabha on the 13th May, 1993 and state:

(a) what were the alleged complaints of Director (Mktg.) of IDPL against the concerned official;

(b) the details ofthe letter in which the concerned official of IDPL was informed that there was no prima facie case for any action;

(c) whether it is a fact that the company was not replying to the letters of the official after receiving them and putting economic pressure on him by delaying tactics; and

(d) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO) : (a) According to the information furnished by IDPL, there was no complaint from the then Director (Marketing) against the concerned official at the time of his transfer and the transfer was made on administrative grounds and was not linked to any complaint.

(b) Through letters dated 25-7-89, 14-8-89, arid 21-9-89, the IDPL management informed one concerned official that his transfer was made on administrative grounds and the outcome of the preliminary enquiry from vigilance angle against him need not be communicated to him.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

Charge Sheet Issued to Marketing Executive, IDPL

462. SHRIMATI 3ARALA MAHESHWARI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the reply to the Unstarred Question No. 1916 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 13th May, 1993 and state:

(a) the reasons of issuing charge sheet in November, 1989 to the Marketing Executive of IDPL when his leave was refused and he was declared on unauthorised absence on June 22, 1989;

(b) whether it is a fact that the rules, under which the charge sheet was issued in November, 1989, were not existing in June/July, 1989;

(c) if so, the reasons for not issuing chargesheet within a reasonable time;

(d) whether it is a fact that the management was harassing and putting economic pressure on the employee by delaying the issuing of the charge sheet when he was declared on unauthorised absence by the authorities in June, 1989, if so, the reasons therefor, and

(e) the reasons of appointing G. M. (Production) as disciplinary authority and not the G. M. (Sales) who is the line of authority as per the IDPL ODA Rules?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO): (a) to (d) Accoiding to the IDPL, although the Marketing Executive was unauthorisedly absent from March 1989, he was given sufficient apportunitics to report for duty and on the said employee's failure to comply and report for duty, a charge sheet was issued in November, 1989. There was no change in the IDPL Conduct, Discipline and Appeal Rules between June 1989 to November, 1989.

(e) As on 17-11-89, there was no General Manager (Sales) on the pay rolls of the Marketing Division. The earlier General Manager (Sales) Dr. S. S. Jolly had been transferred to the factory in Gurgaon as its General Manager.

Charges Agaisnt IDPL Official

463. SHRIMATI SARALA MAHESHWARI: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the reply to the Unstarred Question No.1913 given in the Rajya Sabha on 13-5-93 and state:

(a) the charges of the Director (Mktg.) of IDPL against employee on which the inves-